DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 028 HE 022 166

AUTHOR Rees, Mary Anne
TITLE Performers, Theorists-Historians, Music Educators and Work Autonomy.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; *College Faculty; Higher Education; Musical Composition; Music Education; *Musicians; *Music Teachers; *Professional Autonomy; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching Load

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to determine the amount of autonomy for each of three music faculty types (performers, theorists-historians, and music educators). Autonomy was measured by comparing the actual time devoted to the various job-related activities with the time each faculty type would like to devote to the activities. A questionnaire listing 16 typical activities of music faculty was sent to 207 full-time music faculty members in state-supported universities. The response rate was 54.6%, representing 113 usable responses. Results included the following: (1) all faculty devoted most of their time to teaching-related activities; (2) faculty seem to have considerable autonomy in their teaching duties, in that the teaching activity they most prefer is the one in which they spend the most time; (3) performance faculty would like to devote more time to performance, while theorists-historians and music educators would rather not perform at all; (4) all three faculty types would like to devote more time to research-related activities; (5) music educators and performers devote a great deal of time to administrative and committee work and would rather not, while theorists-historians are only marginally involved in such duties and like that lack of involvement; and (6) performers and music educators work 8 to 10 hours more per week than theorists-historians. It is felt that these results show great differences in the amount of autonomy of music faculty and that these differences have strong management implications for music school administrators. Contains 51 references. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Mary Anne Rees
Northwestern University

ED304028

PERFORMERS, THEORISTS-HISTORIANS, MUSIC EDUCATORS AND WORK AUTONOMY[1]

In his well-known sociological study of the academic profession, Logan Wilson defined faculty in higher education as a heterogeneous lot of individuals who are engaged in diverse duties, but who have a common focus as employees of the university and as members of that broad occupational grouping known in our society as the professions.[2] His broad occupational grouping includes such professions as doctors, dentists, lawyers, and architects in addition to university professors. Persons engaged in these occupations are usually considered to be professionals because they have an expertise in a limited area that has been gained through an extensive and specialized education. Their reference group tends to be other professionals in their own area of expertise. In addition, these professionals expect and have a high degree of autonomy.[3]

University professors are slightly different from other professionals in that they are employed by a highly bureaucratic organization - an institution of higher education. While this does result in a loss of some independence, faculty still tend to be fairly autonomous. However, the variety of subjects taught on a university campus, the different teaching situations, as well as the different kinds of research supported and conducted can lead one to assume that not all university faculty have the same degree of autonomy. This

HE 022 166

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Anne Rees
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

idea is strongly supported by the research of Anthony Biglan.[4] With the differences among faculty in a school of music, Biglan's research suggests that music faculty might also differ according to the various disciplines or areas of expertise within the field of music.

A music faculty is traditionally divided into three areas of specialization: performance, theory and history, and music education. Faculty in these areas seemingly demonstrate their abilities in different ways, stress different curricula, and have different workloads. They also teach in different teacher-student situations. In addition, the education of music faculty members tends to be obtained in one of three different types of institutions: the conservatory, the research university and the normal school.

Because of these differences, music faculty predictably might have different degrees of autonomy on the university campus. The purpose of this research is to determine the amount of autonomy for each music faculty type. Autonomy was measured by comparing the actual time devoted to the various job related activities with the time each faculty type would like to devote to the activities. Hence, those faculty who devoted the greatest amount of time to the activities they most preferred were said to have the greatest amount of autonomy. For the purposes of this study, composers, who demonstrate their expertise through performance and creative activity, were considered to be performance faculty.

Numerous studies touch upon topics related to this research. Detailed descriptions of the university teaching profession have been written by Wilson,[5] Caplow and McGee,[6] Eble,[7] Medalia,[8] Millett,[9] Altbach,[10] and Mandell.[11] Additional works on the profession include those by Clark[12] and Adams.[13] The profession of university music teaching has been addressed by Bukofzer[14] and Griffel.[15]

The literature on actual and preferred time devoted to work activities includes a study of optometry professors and their workloads by Bleything.[16] Fry,[17] Shulman,[18] and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education[19] have also addressed the issue of workloads and the time devoted to faculty duties. Essays on faculty work have been written by Long[20] and Ross.[21] Studies of the research productivity of college faculty have been done by Jauch, Glueck, and Osborn[22] and Orpen.[23] Music faculty members' preferences of particular activities have been examined by Carpenter,[24] and Bacon.[25]

The types of faculty in a school of music have been discussed in essays by John,[26] Finney,[27] Ackerman,[28] Filas,[29] Anderson and Weidensaul,[30] Kennedy,[31] Barresi,[32] Kohs,[33] and Perkins.[34] The differences in their educational backgrounds have been discussed by Schuller,[35] Clarke,[36] Bain,[37] and Hendrich.[38]

This research is somewhat similar to the Biglan research on university faculty[39] in that it will study the characteristics and output of different types of university faculty. Unlike the work of Biglan, this study will concentrate on faculty in different areas of expertise within one academic discipline.

Data Collection Procedures

In gathering the data for this paper, a questionnaire was sent to 207 full-time music faculty members in six state-supported university schools/departments of music. Geographically, these schools span the entire United States. All schools offer degrees up to the doctoral level.

Of the 207 questionnaires distributed, 113 usable responses were returned giving a response rate of 54.6%.

The sample for this study did not differ widely from the national norm for university faculty members.[40] The subjects had an average age of 47. Males comprised 79.6% of the subjects.

Most of the subjects obtained their education at a university. The subjects had an average of 16.2 years full-time experience in higher education and have taught at an average of 2.5 different institutions.

The ranks of assistant, associate and full professors are fairly evenly divided among the subjects.[41]

Results

The questionnaire for this study[42] contains a list of sixteen activities in which music faculty are commonly engaged.[43] Faculty indicated the number of hours per week they devoted to teaching, performance, and research activities. In addition, they indicated the

time spent in activities related to their professional organizations, administration, student advising, and community. Differences were found in the number of hours dedicated to various teaching activities as well as performance, research, and administration.

Because it was assumed that faculty are not completely autonomous, data were also collected on each faculty member's preferred way of spending time. Subjects indicated whether they would rather spend more or less time in each of the job-related activities. The preferences differed throughout for the three types of faculty. Because the responses for these data are relative to the number of hours actually spent in each of the activities, the results for these two sets of data will be presented together.

Teaching

Table 1 presents the actual and preferred time devoted to teaching activities. Data on the actual number of hours spent per week as well as the time faculty preferred to spend in five different activities is displayed. These activities include the teaching of classes and seminars, the conducting of ensembles, applied instructon, and the supervision of student teachers and dissertations.

The faculty differed considerably in the amount of time they devoted to the various teaching activities. This is especially true when comparing the amount of time devoted to the teaching of courses and the amount of time devoted to applied instruction. Although some performance instruction is taught in a classroom setting, most

Table 1. Teaching Activities

	Actual Time Spent (Hours per Week) Mean by Faculty Type			Preferred Way of Spending Time Mean by Faculty Type		
	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education
Teaching courses & seminars - Percentage who would like to spend:	8.0	16.4	13.5**			
More time				25.4%	16.7%	31.6%
About the same				54. %	72.2%	63.2%
Less time				15.9%	11.1%	5.2%
Not be involved				4.7%	0. %	0. %
Conducting ensembles - Percentage who would like to spend:**	5.9	1.8	2.2*			
More time				21.9%	12.4%	0. %
About the same				34.4%	31.3%	21.1%
Less time				17.1%	12.5%	10.6%
Not be involved				26.6%	43.8%	68.3%
Applied instruction - Percentage who would like to spend:**	12.7	1.9	.3**			
More time				29.8%	0. %	11.1%
About the same				40.6%	42.9%	16.6%
Less time				20.3%	0. %	5.6%
Not be involved				9.3%	57.1%	66.7%
Supervising student teachers - Percentage who sould like to spend:*	1.1	.6	6.4**			
More time				3.3%	6.6%	15.8%
About the same				15. %	26.7%	26.3%
Less time				11.7%	0. %	31.6%
Not be involved				70. %	66.7%	26.3%
Supervising dissertations - Percentage who would like to spend:**	1.8	3.6	4.3**			
More time				20. %	27.8%	22.2%
About the same				30. %	50. %	55.6%
Less time				11.7%	22.2%	16.6%
Not be involved				38.3%	0. %	5.6%

* Response differences are at the .01 level of statistical significance.
** Response differences are at the .05 level of statistical significance.

instruction in this area is given through applied instruction. Hence, most of the teaching time of performance faculty naturally is devoted to applied instruction. Theorists, historians, and music educators, however, traditionally teach in the classroom setting and thus devoted most of their teaching time to the teaching of courses and seminars.

The actual time devoted to teaching--teaching courses and seminars, conducting ensembles, applied instruction, and the supervision of student teachers and dissertations--is listed in Table 1 and clearly distinguishes the three faculty types. Theorists, historians, and music educators, who devoted the greatest amount of time to teaching courses and seminars, spent 16.4 hours and 13.5 hours per week respectively in this activity. As one might expect, performers devoted the least amount of time to the teaching of classes and seminars (8.0 hours per week), and the largest number of hours to applied instruction (12.7 hours per week).

Performance faculty (which includes conductors) spent the most time conducting ensembles--5.9 hours per week. As with applied instruction, the other two types of faculty devoted only a small amount of time to this activity. Music educators devoted the greatest amount of time to the supervision of both student teachers and dissertations.

The faculty in this study seemed to prefer teaching. This is especially the case in the teaching of courses and seminars as a great majority of all three subgroups indicated that they would like to devote the same or more time to this activity (see Table 1). In the

preferred time responses, 79.4% of the performers, 88.9% of the theorists and historians, and 94.8% if the music educators indicated that they would like to devote the same or more time to the teaching of courses and seminars.

Theorists, historians, and music educators, who demonstrate their expertise through scholarly research, tended to be very satisfied with the time they devoted to the supervision of dissertations. Approximately 77% of these two types were either satisfied with the amount of time they devoted to graduate student dissertations, or they would like to devote more time to this activity. While 50% of the performance faculty were satisfied with their disseration supervisory work, 38.3% would rather not be involved in this activity.

As the performance area of expertise also includes conductors, over 55% of this group would like to devote the same or more time to conducting. Another 26.6% of the performers, however, would rather not be involved in conducting. Those who preferred not to be involved in conducting also include 43.8% of the theorists and historians and 68.3% of the music educators.

While over 80% of the performers seem to be satisfied with the time devoted to applied instruction, the theorists and historians seemed to be evenly split in their attitudes toward this activity. The theory and history faculty were either satisfied with the time spent in applied instruction or they would rather not be involved at all. The majority of music educators preferred not to be involved in this activity. Although a large proportion of the performance (40.6%)

and theory-history (42.9%) faculty preferred to spend "about the same" amount of time on applied instruction, performers devoted 12.7 hours per week on this activity while theorists and historians only devoted 1.9 hours per week.

Music educators, who devoted the greatest amount of time to the supervision of student teachers, did not seem to have a strong desire to devote more time to this activity. In fact, 26.3% of this faculty type would rather not be involved in the supervision of student teachers. Over 65% of the other two faculty types also preferred not to be involved.

In comparing the actual number of hours devoted to the various teaching activities with the activities in which the faculty preferred to spend their time, the three types of faculty all appear to have a good amount of autonomy. They devoted the greatest amount of teaching time to the activity they most preferred. For the performers, this preferred activity was applied instruction. For the other two subgroups, this activity was the teaching of courses and seminars. In addition, the activity where the three groups devoted the least amount of time was the activity in which each group preferred to not be involved. For the performers and theorists-historians, this least preferred activity was student teacher supervision. For the music education faculty, this activity was applied instruction. Therefore, it appears that there is a good match for all three faculty types between the preferred teaching activities and the teaching activities where they devoted the greatest amount of time.

Demonstration of Expertise

Performance

Table 2 presents the findings on actual and preferred time devoted to performance activities. Subjects indicated the actual hours devoted to activities of this nature as well as the time they would like to devote to performance.

Performance faculty (which include composers and conductors) predictably spent the greatest amount of time in performance activities. This is especially true in the preparation of solo recitals as they devoted an average of over seven hours per week to this activity. Faculty in the other two areas of expertise, who were only marginally involved in performance, devoted fewer than three hours per week to performance and composition. While theorists-historians concentrated their performance efforts in preparing for solo recitals, music educators devoted their performance time to faculty ensemble performances.

In general, performers liked to perform and would like to have devoted more time to performance activities. More than half of the performers in this study preferred to devote more time in particular to the preparation of solo recitals (see Table 2). As performance faculty primarily demonstrate their expertise by giving recitals, this is to be expected. They also seemed to prefer to spend more time preparing for solo recitals than in preparing for faculty ensemble performances. Almost half of the performers preferred to spend less

Table 2. Performance Activities

Activity	Actual Time Spent (Hours per Week) Mean by Faculty Type			Preferred Way of Spending Time Mean by Faculty Type			Output	Mean by Faculty Type		
	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education		Performance	Theory-History	Music Education
Preparing for solo recital - percentage who would like to spend:*	7.1	1.5	.3**				No. of recitals in 1 year	2.1	.8	.1
More time				54. %	14.2%	0. %				
About the same				17.5%	21.4%	5.5%	No. of performances in 1 year	22.1	18.3	5.5
Less time				1.5%	0. %	5.6%				
Not be involved				27.0%	64.4%	88.9%				
Preparing for faculty ensemble performances - percentage who would like to spend:*	3.5	.7	1.1**				No. of performances in 1 year that include an original composition	7.8	.0	.1
More time				29.5%	33.4%	5.6%				
About the same				24.6%	13.2%	16.7%				
Less time				22.9%	6.7%	0. %				
Not be involved				23.0%	46.7%	77.7%				
Composing - percentage who would like to spend:	2.1	.0	.3				No. of performances at professional meetings in 1 year	6.6	.7	.5
More time				28. %	7.1%	17.6%				
About the same				14. %	14.3%	0. %				
Less time				3.5%	7.1%	0. %				
Not be involved				54.5%	71.5%	82.4%				

* Response differences are at the .01 level of statistical significance.
** Response differences are at the .05 level of statistical significance.

time or would rather not be involved at all with faculty ensembles. The majority of theorists and historians and music educators would rather not be involved in solo recitals or faculty ensembles. Over 25% of the performance faculty would like to devote more time to composition.

In the consideration of performance activities, performance faculty had the greatest autonomy. The data demonstrate that this type of faculty devoted the greatest amount of time to the activity they preferred the most. Over 50% of the performers would like to devote more time to the preparation of solo recitals. The data for the theory-history and music education faculty, however, hint at some dissatisfaction. While the faculty in these two subgroups were only slightly involved in performance, the majority of both groups would rather not be involved in performance at all.

Research

Table 3 presents the actual time and preferred time devoted to research activities. Subjects provided information on their involvement in the reading of professional books and articles and on their involvement in research.

The members of the theory-history faculty, in spending 5.6 hours per week reading job-related books and articles and 8.3 hours per week in their own research, devoted the most time to research activities. Music educators, who dedicated less time than the theorists and historians to their own research (5.4 hours per week), devoted the

Table 3. Research Activities

Activity	Actual Time Spent (Hours per Week) Mean by Faculty Type			Preferred Way of Spending Time Mean by Faculty Type			Research Output	Mean by Faculty Type		
	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education		Performance	Theory-History	Music Education
Reading books, articles - percentage who would like to spend:	3.8	5.6	5.6*				No. of books published in last 5 years	.1	.6	.4*
More time				43.5%	66.6%	57.9%	No. of articles published in referred journals in last 5 years	.9	4.7	2.1*
About the same				35.5%	33.4%	31.5%				
Less time				16.1%	0. %	10.6%				
Not be involved				4.9%	0. %	0. %				
Research - percentage who would like to spend:	3.7	8.3	5.4*				No. of papers read in last 5 years.	.8	3.8	3. *
More time				51.7%	72.2%	84.2%				
About the same				26.7%	16.7%	10.5%				
Less time				10.0%	11.1%	0. %	No. of presentations given in last 5 years	2.6	1.3	5.0*
Not be involved				11.6%	0. %	5.3%				

* Response differences are at the .01 level of statistical significance.

same number of hours to reading professional books and articles. Performers devoted fewer than four hours per week to each of the research activities.

While performance activities seemed to be of particular interest to the performance faculty, research activities were of great interest to all three faculty types . Over 75% of each faculty type would like to devote the same or more time to research. In the reading of professional books and articles, only approximately 20% of the performers and 10% of the music educators would like to devote less time (or not be involved at all). Research also seemed to have a high appeal. Over 94% of the music educators would have liked to devote the same or more time to research. Over 86% of the theorists-historians and 78.4% of the performance faculty also held this opinion.

Although research activities are often thought to be the means by which theorists, historians, and music educators demonstrate their expertise, the data demonstrated that all three groups of faculty had a strong desire to devote more time to these activities. Possible reasons for this preference might be that research is highly rewarded in the faculty members' schools of music or universities, or that a strong research reputation is perceived as being instrumental in achieving status. At any rate, this strong desire to devote more time to research might indicate a source of some dissatisfaction. It might also suggest an area in which faculty do not have as much autonomy as they would prefer.

Professional Organization Activities

Table 4 presents the actual and preferred time devoted to professional organizations. In addition, it provides the data on the nature of professional organization commitments.

Music educators, who spent the greatest number of hours per week serving as an officer or committee member in their professional organizations, appeared to be content with the 3.9 hours per week devoted to that activity. Over 55% indicated that they would like to spend about the same amount of time. Theorists-historians also indicated that they would like to spend about the same amount of time. At that time, however, they devoted the fewest number of hours per week (2.3 hours) to their professional organizations. Performers devoted 2.56 hours per week but would rather not be involved at all in that activity.

Administration

The data on administrative activities are displayed in Table 5. The activities included are the general activity of administration as well as music and university committee memberships.

The amount of time devoted to administrative activities and committee work also differs among music faculty. Music educators spent by far the greatest amount of time in activities related to administration (8.4 hours per week). They also devoted the greatest number of hours to their school of music and university committees

Table 4. Professional Organization Activities

Activity	Actual Time Spent (Hours per Week) Mean by Faculty Type			Preferred Way of Spending Time Mean by Faculty Type			Nature of Professional Organization Commitment	Mean by Faculty Type		
	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education		Performance	Theory-History	Music Education
Serving as officer or committee member in professional group - Percentage who would like to spend:	2.6	2.3	3.9*				No. of offices held	.63	.47	.54
							No. of committee memberships	.59	.89	.86
More time				13.1%	16.7%	0. %	No. of annual meetings attended	1.17	1.57	1.54
About the same				31.1%	55.6%	57.9%				
Less time				13.2%	5.6%	26.3%	No. of memberships currently held	1.81	2.11	1.55
Not be involved				42.6%	22.1%	15.8%				

* Response differences are at the .05 level of statistical significance.

Table 5. Administrative Activities

Activity	Actual Time Spent (Hours per Week) Mean by Faculty Type			Preferred Way of Spending Time Mean by Faculty Type			Committee Membership During Last Two Years Mean by Faculty Type			
	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education		Performance	Theory-History	Music Education
General administrative duties - Percentage who would like to spend:	4.8	2.3	8.4*							
More time				3.3%	13.3%	22.2%				
About the same				28.8%	33.3%	27.8%				
Less time				20.4%	0. %	33.3%				
Not be involved				47.5%	53.4%	19.7%				
School of music committees - Percentage who would like to spend:	2.6	2.1	3.4				No. School of Music Committees	3.05	2.7	3.8
More time				3.0%	11.0%	5.3%				
About the same				41.5%	55.6%	36.8%				
Less time				36.9%	11.2%	42.1%				
Not be involved				18.6%	22.2%	15.8%				
University committees - Percentage who would like to spend:*	1.0	1.7	2.0*				No. University Committees	.9	1.8	2.0
More time				9.8%	11.8%	21.1%				
About the same				24.6%	58.8%	36.8%				
Less time				18.0%	23.5%	26.3%				
Not be involved				47.6%	5.9%	15.8%				

* Response differences are at the .01 level of statistical significance.

(5.4 hours per week). By spending only 2.3 hours per week, the theory and history faculty devoted the least amount of time to general administrative duties. They also devoted the least amount of time to committees in the school of music. Performers spent the fewest number of hours in university committees.

The music education faculty members, who devoted the greatest amount of time to general administrative duties and committee work, seem to be split in their preferences for these types of activities. Generally, however, they preferred to devote the same or less time. Over 60% of the music education subgroup indicated that they would like to devote about the same or less time to administrative/committee work.

The performers seem to be more in agreement with their responses. Approximately half of the performance faculty preferred to not be involved at all in any administrative work or in university committees. This seems to concur with the findings of a recent study of university faculty. Janet B. Bacon found that artists-performers (from the visual, musical, and theatrical arts) believed that committee work was an infringement on their time.[44] Performers do seem to be somewhat more satisfied with the time they devote to school of music committees (2.6 hours per week). Over 41% stated that they preferred to spend about the same amount of time in this activity.

Other Activities

Subjects also reported the number of hours spent in advising students and in job-related community activities. These data are shown in Table 6.

All three groups of faculty seemed to be satisfied with the amount of time they devote to advising students. About 50% of the performers and music educators indicated this response. Although the same proportion of these two types of faculty indicated the same degree of satisfaction, the performers devoted much less time to this activity than the music educators. Performers spent 3.5 hours per week advising students while music educators spent 6.3 hours per week. Of the theory-history subgroup, who devoted an average of only 2.6 hours per week, over 75% stated that they would like to devote about the same amount of time.

Although performers and theorists-historians devoted the greatest and least amount of time (4.4 hours and 2.2 hours respectively) to job-related community activities, both groups preferred to devote about the same amount of time to this duty. Music educators devoted 3.9 hours per week to community activities. The majority of this group preferred to devote less time.

Faculty were also asked to indicate the number of hours spent per week in any other job-related activities that were not included in the questionnaire. Four subjects responded and specified activities such as the adjudication of competitions, work with computer-assisted instruction, and the care and maintenance of instruments. Time devoted to these activities ranged from two to five hours per week.

Table 6. Other Activities

	Actual Time Spent (Hours per Week) Mean by Faculty Type			Preferred Way of Spending Time Mean by Faculty Type		
	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education
Advising students - Percentage who would like to spend:	3.5*	2.6	6.3			
More time				7.8%	0. %	10.6%
About the same				53.1%	76.4%	52.6%
Less time				20.3%	11.8%	26.3%
Not be involved				18.8%	11.8%	10.5%
Community activities - Percentage who would like to spend:	4.4	2.2	3.9			
More time				6.7%	17.6%	5.6%
About the same				58.3%	52.9%	38.9%
Less time				21.7%	23.6%	44.4%
Not be involved				13.3%	5.9%	11.1%

* Response differences are at the .05 level of statistical significance.

Activity Type Scores

In order to examine the number of hours devoted to four general types of activities (teaching, performance, research, and administration), subtotal scores were determined for each activity type. Each score is a sum of the hours devoted to the activities in the respective categories. The teaching score represents a sum of the hours devoted to teaching classes and seminars, conducting ensembles, applied instruction, and the supervision of student teachers and dissertations. The performance score was determined by adding the time spent in solo recital preparation, faculty ensemble performances, and composition. The research score is a sum of the hours spent in reading and research. The hours devoted to administrative duties and committees were added to compute the administrative score.[45]

Table 7 shows the teaching, performance, research, and administration scores as well as the total number of hours each faculty type devoted to its job.

Table 7. Total and Subtotal Hours Per Week Devoted to Job

	Actual Time Spent (Hours per Week)		
	Mean by Faculty Type		
	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education
Teaching Score	28.4	24.4	26.7
Performance Score	11.8	2.3	1.6 *
Research Score	7.2	13.8	10.9 *
Administrative Score	7.6	6.2	13.9 *
Total Hours Per Week Devoted to Job	63.6	53.8	61.2 *

* Response differences are at the .01 level of statistical significance.

Although different teaching activities consumed a range of hours among the three faculty types, each group spent approximately the same total amount of time in teaching. The faculty in this sample devoted an average of 61.4 hours per week to their jobs. A large portion (44.4% or 27.3 hours) of that time was spent in teaching and related activities. This finding agrees with the Willie and Stecklin study of faculty that states, "teaching and activities related to teaching occupy the major portion of faculty members' time."[46]

This large proportion of time devoted to teaching does, however, contradict the results of two other studies about university faculty members. In its study of faculty and students, the Carnegie Commission found that fewer than 3% of university faculty members devoted more than 20 hours per week to teaching.[47] Fry's study, done at the University of Queensland, indicates that university faculty spend only about 25% of their time in teaching.[48] This discrepancy may be due to differences in the samples used for these studies. While this study included only music faculty members in its sample, the Carnegie Council and Fry studies used samples which included faculty from all academic disciplines.

The research of Biglan and Ladd and Lipset compares university faculty in different academic disciplines.[49] In their investigation of the different amounts of time devoted to teaching by faculty in different subject areas, their findings indicate that faculty in different academic disciplines do devote different amounts of time to teaching related duties. Therefore, it appears that faculty in the discipline of music devote more time to teaching than their colleagues in other academic areas.

Table 7 also presents the performance, research, and administrative subtotal scores. Performers spent the greatest amount of time in performance and devoted 11.8 hours per week to those activities. The theory and history faculty devoted an average of 2.3 hours per week to performance. The music education faculty, who devoted the least time per week to performance, spent an average of 1.6 hours per week in activities of this nature.

Theorists and historians devoted the greatest amount of time to research activities (13.8 hours per week). In their study of college teachers, Willie and Stecklein reported that faculty spend approximately 20% of their time in research.[50] While this figure would be low for the theory-history faculty, it would be high for the music education and performance faculty. A comparison of the research scores with the total hours devoted to the job indicates that theorists-historians devote 25% of their time to research. Music education and performance faculty devoted 17.8% and 11.3% of their time respectively to research.

The music education faculty devoted the greatest number of hours per week to administrative duties. Their average administrative score is 13.9 hours per week. Theorists-historians, who spent only about half as much time as the music educators, devoted 6.2 hours per week to administrative duties. The average administrative score for the performance faculty is 7.6 hours per week, a figure close to the theory-history score.

The subjects of this study devoted an average of 61.4 hours per week to their jobs. Performers, who worked 63.6 hours per week, devoted the greatest amount of time to their occupation. Theorists and historians devoted the least amount of time and worked 53.8 hours per week.

Most faculty work about 55 hours per week according to research by Shulman.[51] Performers and music educators devoted much more time to their jobs. The theorists-historians, however, seem to be quite close to the average figure for university faculty. In examining the number of hours devoted to the various activities, faculty members in performance and music education devoted more time than the theorists-historians to teaching and administrative activities, to the advising of students, and to community activities. In addition, performers devoted much more time to performance activities.

Summary and Conclusions

Differences do exist among the three types of faculty in the way they spend their time as well as in the way they prefer to spend their time. In addition, the faculty types do appear to have different degrees of autonomy.

All faculty devoted the majority of their time to teaching-related activities. While the performance faculty spent most of their teaching time in applied instruction and conducting, the theory-history and music education faculty devoted the majority of their teaching time to classroom instruction. Performance and theory-history faculty devoted the least teaching time to student teacher supervision. Music educators devoted the least amount of time to applied instruction.

The faculty seem to have considerable autonomy in their teaching duties. The teaching activity they most preferred is the teaching activity in which they spend the most time. In addition, the teaching activity they least preferred is the teaching activity to which they devote the fewest number of hours. This is true for all three types of faculty.

In the demonstration of expertise, data were gathered on performance and research activities. The performance faculty devoted the greatest number of hours to performance-related activities and they participated in the greatest number of performances. Faculty in the area of performance would like to devote more time to performance. The theory-history and music education faculty, who are only marginally involved in performance, would rather not be involved at all in this type of activity.

The faculty spent different amounts of time in research-oriented activities. The theory-history faculty devoted the most time per week to research. The performance faculty were least involved. While performance seemed to only be of interest to the performance faculty, research was of great interest to all three types of faculty. All three faculty types indicated a preference to devote more time to research-related activities.

In the demonstration of expertise, the faculty did not appear to have as much autonomy as it would like. Performers were heavily involved in performance and the theorists-historians and music educators devoted the most time to research. In examining their time preferences, performers were the only faculty members who would like to devote more time to performance. Everyone, however, would like to devote more time to research.

Varying degrees of autonomy were seen in the actual and preferred time devoted to the other job-related activities. This is particularly true in the case of administrative duties. While music educators and performers devoted a great deal of time to both administrative and committee work, both faculty types indicated that they would rather not be as involved in activities of that nature. The theory-history faculty were only marginally involved in administrative duties and seemed to like it that way.

In comparing the activities that occupy most of the faculty's time with their preferred activities, the theory-history faculty appeared to be the most autonomous. The activities where they devoted the most time

are the activities that they most preferred. This was not true with the other two faculty types. Performers and music educators devoted considerable time to administrative duties. It seems that this time devoted to administration was at the expense of time that could be devoted to research or other preferred activities.

An examination of the total hours per week devoted to work reveals that the performers and music educators worked eight to ten hours more per week than their colleagues in theory and history. The performance and music education faculty devoted this extra time to teaching, advising students, administrative, and community activities.

This paper demonstrates that the three music types--performers, theorists-historians, and music educators--differ greatly in the amount of autonomy they have. In addition, they differ greatly in the hours they devoted to their job, and they differ in their work activities and in their work preferences. These differences among the faculty have strong management implications for music school administrators.

Because of limited budgets and resources, many departments are now held much more accountable for their faculty members' time. Music administrators are finding that they need to supply increasingly more detailed reports on faculty and their workloads. This study is unique in that it provides administrators and faculty with detailed data on music faculty's autonomy and workloads. This information can give an administrator additional insight to the faculty of a music school--insight which might prove useful in making administrative decisions.

NOTES

[1]This article is based on a paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music in Houston, Texas, November 1985.

[2] Logan Wilson, The Academic Man (London: Oxford University Press, 1942), p. 113.

[3] See Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962), pp. 60-62; and Wayne K. Hoy and Cecil G. Miskel, Educational Administration (New York: Random House, 1978), pp. 110-111.

[4] Anthony Biglan, "The Characteristics of Subject Matter in Different Academic Areas," Journal of Applied Psychology 57 (1973): 195-203; Idem, "Relationships Between Subject Matter Characteristics and the Structure and Output of University Departments," Journal of Applied Psychology 57 (1972): 204-213.

[5] Wilson, The Academic Man.

[6] Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, The Academic Marketplace (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1965).

[7] Kenneth E. Eble, Professors As Teachers (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972).

[8] N. Z. Medalia, On Becoming a College Teacher, Southern Regional Education Board Monograph Number 6 (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963).

[9] Fred B. Millett, Professor (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1961).

[10] Altbach, "Stark Realities: The Academic Profession in the 1980's," pp. 221-238.

[11] Richard D. Mandell, The Professor Game (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1977).

[12] Burton R. Clark, "Faculty Culture," in The Study of Campus Cultures, ed. Terry F. Lunsford (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963), pp. 39-54.

[13] Hazard Adams, The Academic Tribes (New York: Liveright, 1976).

[14] Manfred Bukofzer, The Place of Musicology in American Institutions of Higher Education (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1957).

[15] L. Michael Griffel, "Teaching Music," in Scholars Who Teach, ed. Steven M. Cahn (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1978), pp. 193-216.

[16] Willard B. Bleything, "On the Workload of Faculty. Part III: Faculty Load Formulas," Journal of Optometric Education 8 (1982): 18-22.

[17] Neville H. Fry, "Academic Staff Work Loads in a University," Journal of Educational Administration 19 (1981): 93-105.

[18] Carol Herrnstadt Shulman, "That Wonderfun 12-Hour Work Week," AGB Reports 23 (1981): 15-19.

[19] Martin Trow, ed., Teachers and Students (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975).

[20] Newell H. Long, "The Music Teacher in the Academic Community," Music Journal 21 (1963): 34, 65-66.

[21] Ronald D. Ross, "Faculty Accountability and the Performing Arts," College Music Symposium 16 (1976): 123-132.

[22] Lawrence R. Jauch, William F. Gluek, Richard N. Osborn, "Organizational Loyalty, Professional Commitment, and Academic Research Productivity, "Academy of Management Journal 21 (1978): 84-92.

[23] Christopher Orpen, "Tenure and Academic Productivity: Another Look," Improving College and University Teaching 30 (1982): 60-62.

[24] Regan Carpenter, "A Study of Artists-in-Residence at American Colleges and Universities," Contemporary Education 43 (1972): 144-146.

[25] Janet N. Bacon, "Conflict and Accord: The Artist and Humanist in the University" (Ed.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1979).

[26] Robert W. John, "Degrees, Titles, and College Music Teaching," Music Educators Journal 66 (1979): 58-59.

[27] Ross Lee Finney, "Employ the Composer," American Music Teacher 11 (1961): 8-9, 28-29.

[28] James S. Ackerman, "The Arts in Higher Education," in Content and Context, ed. Carl Kaysen (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), pp. 219-266.

[29] Thomas J. Filas, "Professional Musician vs. Music Educator," Music Educators Journal 48 (1962): 124-125.

[30] Julia Anderson and Jane Weidensaul, "Artist on Campus," Music Journal 34 (1976): 10-11, 41.

[31] James Paul Kennedy, "The Concert Artist in Education," Music Journal 25 (1967): 87-88.

[32] Anthony Barresi, "The Artist and Educator Controversy," Dialogue in Instrumental Music Education 4 (1980): 48-59.

[33] Ellis B. Kohs, "The Status of the Composer-Educator," Musical America 70 (1950): 29.

[34] James A. Perkins, "The University and the Arts," Music Educators Journal 52 (1966): 49-51, 210-211.

[35] Gunther Schuller, "What and Why is a Conservatory?" Music Journal 26 (1968): 44.

[36] Eric Clarke, "Can Music Teachers Be Artists and Educators?" in Music Teachers National Association, Proceedings, Thirty-Fourth Series (Pittsburgh: Music Teachers National Association, 1940), pp. 24-30.

[37] "Music: A Major Force in American Universities--An Interview with Dr. Wilfred Bain, Dean of the Indiana University School of Music," The Australian Journal of Music Education 12 (1973): 11-15.

[38] Robin Myrer Hendrich, "The Future of Musical Performance Training: The Conservatory vs. the University" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1978).

[39] Biglan, "The Characteristics of Subject Matter in Different Academic Areas," pp. 195-203; Biglan, "Relationships Between Subject Matter Characteristics and the Structure and Output of University Departments," pp. 204-213.

[40] The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Three Thousand Futures (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1981), p. 312.

[41] 27.4%, 31.9%, 53.3% of the respondents hold the rank of assistant, associate, and full professor respectively. The rank of instructor is held by .4% of the respondents.

[42] This questionnaire is modeled after a questionnaire used by John W. Gustad in his study of college teachers. See John W. Gustad, The Career Decisions of College Teachers, Southern Regional Education Board Monograph Series Number 2 (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1960).

[43] The activities were taken from a list of teaching load activities developed by the National Association of Schools of Music. See Timothy A. Rowe, Music in Higher Education (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Schools of Music, 1981), pp. 49-56.

[44] Bacon, "Conflict and Accord: The Artist and Humanist in the University," p. v.

[45] As each teaching score is a sum of the hours devoted to each teaching activity, scores were not determined for those subjects with three or more missing values. No missing values were allowed in the tabulation of the performance, research, or administrative scores.

[46] Willie and Stecklein, "A Three-Decade Comparison of College Faculty Characteristics," p. 16.

[47] Trow, ed., Teachers and Students, p. 48.

[48] Fry, "Academic Staff Work Loads in a University," p. 97.

[49] See Biglan, "Relationships Between Subject Matter Characteristics and the Structure and Output of University Departments," 204-213; and Ladd and Lipset, "How Professors Spend Their Time," p. 2.

[50] Willie and Stecklein, "A Three-Decade Comparison of College Faculty Characteristics," p. 86.

[51] Shulman, "That Wonderful 12-Hour Work Week," p. 16.